

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 5-8 and 10-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Puvvada et al. (5,952,286).

The claims have been amended to distinguish more clearly over Puvvada. Specifically, claim 1 has been amended to make clearer that the inventive compositions are laundry compositions, incorporating a laundry detergent ingredient selected from Markush group of laundry ingredients. Support for this amendment may be found at pages 10-13 and in the examples of the specification.

Applicants' amended claim 1 distinguishes more clearly over Puvvada. Puvvada is directed to liquid cleaning compositions which are personal wash compositions. This is clear from Puvvada's statement in the Field of Invention referring to "liquid cleansing compositions of the type which are typically used as skin cleansing or shower gel compositions." By contrast, applicants' invention is directed to laundry compositions. Puvvada does not appear to teach or suggest any laundry compositions and/or any laundry ingredients presently recited by the amended claim 1. Consequently, it is respectfully requested that the rejection over Puvvada be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Klier et al. (5,538,662). The amended claim 1 distinguishes more clearly over Klier by specifically reciting that the compositions are free of microemulsions as supported by the specification at page 5, lines 9-11 and in the examples of the specification. In addition, claim 4 distinguishes over Klier even further, since it incorporates the elements of the amended claim 1 and further recites merely 3-6% by weight of alcohol gelling agent. Klier employs gelling agent as a co-solvent and so requires

much higher amounts, at least 30% higher amounts than those recited by applicants' claim 4. See column 3, lines 10-11. Thus, it is not seen how one of ordinary skill in the art would have been led by Klier to arrive at compositions which do not include microemulsions, whereas the very nature of the compositions in Klier is microemulsions and, furthermore, employ lower amounts of alcohol, and in the instance of applicants' claim 4 much lower amounts of alcohol as a gelling agent. Consequently, it is respectfully requested that the rejections over Klier be reconsidered and withdrawn.

In light of the availability of Terminal Disclaimer practice, applicants agree to the filing of the Terminal Disclaimer upon an indication of the allowable subject matter.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully requested that the application be allowed to issue.

If a telephone conversation would be of assistance in advancing the prosecution of the present application, applicants' undersigned attorney invites the Examiner to telephone at the number provided.

Respectfully submitted,


Rimma Mitelman
Registration No. 34,396
Attorney for Applicant(s)

RM/sa
(201) 894-2671